DECLARATION OF MATTHIAS KAMBER IN SUPPORT OF GOOGLE INC.'S MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF ORACLE'S EXPERT REPORTS

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

I, MATTHIAS KAMBER, declare as follows:

2

4

5

7

9

8

10

1112

13 14

15

1617

18

1920

2122

2324

25

2627

28

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and a partner at the law firm of Keker & Van Nest LLP, counsel to Google Inc. ("Google") in the above-captioned action. I submit this declaration in support of Google's Motion to Strike Portion of Oracle's Expert Reports. I have knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called upon as a witness, I could testify to them competently under oath.
- Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of Exhibits A-S from the
 July 29, 2011 Opening Expert Report of John C. Mitchell Regarding Copyright.
- 3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of an email string between Christa Anderson and Annette Hurst.
- 4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the expert report of Mr. Robert Zeidman.
- 5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the expert report of Dr. Doug Schmidt.
- 6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the expert report of Dr. Chris Kemerer.
- 7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of a January 14, 2016 letter from Eugene M. Paige to Annette Hurst.
- 8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of a January 21, 2016 email from Eugene M. Paige to counsel for Oracle.
- 9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** is a true and correct copy of a January 22, 2016 letter from Andrew Silverman to Eugene M. Paige.
- 10. On November 5, 2015, Dan Purcell and I, on behalf of Google, had a conference call with at least Annette Hurst and Ayanna Lewis-Gruss, on behalf of Oracle, to meet and confer in accordance with the Court's October 26, 2015 Order Re Damage Studies. [ECF No. 1349.] During that call Oracle never suggested that it might seek damages related to additional copyrighted works, which—because the copyrights for Java SE 6 and 7 post-date earlier versions of Android—would have called for different damages periods. To the contrary, the parties agreed

that the case presented a single, unified damages phase, as reflected in both parties' responses to the Court's Order. [ECF Nos. 1362, 1364.] Dated: January 27, 2016 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP By: /s/ Matthias A. Kamber ROBERT A. VAN NEST CHRISTA M. ANDERSON DANIEL PURCELL Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC. DECLARATION OF MATTHIAS KAMBER IN SUPPORT OF GOOGLE INC.'S MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF ORACLE'S EXPERT REPORTS

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA